

UPDATES FROM BARATZ & ASSOCIATES, P. A. FOR THE HEALTHCARE INDUSTRY

February 2009
Issue 4

EXPANDED SCRUTINY OF HOSPITALS ON ITS WAY

Hospitals and Health Systems can expect an intensification and expansion of post-payment review by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) through the Recovery Audit Contractor (RAC) program, as soon as early 2009.

As part of the Medicare Prescription Drug Improvement and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA), the Department of Health and Human Services conducted a 3 year demonstration program using RACs to determine whether they would be a cost-effective approach to identifying and correcting improper Medicare payments. The program was tested in Arizona, Massachusetts and South Carolina.

Improper payments are described as:

- Payments made for services that do not meet Medicare's medical necessity criteria;
- Payments made for services that are incorrectly coded;
- Providers fail to submit documentation when requested, or fail to submit enough documentation to support the claim;
- Other reasons;
- Medicare Secondary Payer (MSP) – improper payments can occur when Medicare pays a claim that should have been paid by a different health insurance Company according to CMS.

CMS' report, as of March 27, 2008, states that RACs succeeded in correcting more than \$1.03 billion in Medicare improper payments. Over 96 percent (\$993 million) were overpayments collected from providers while the remaining 4 percent (\$38 million) were underpayments repaid to providers. On the MSP front the RACs collected \$12.7 million.

When you look at the correction rate it was 0.3 percent of the claims reviewed but still amounted to a significant number. Providers choosing to appeal 14.0 percent of the claims were successful on only 4.6 percent. 85 percent of the recoveries were from inpatient hospital providers with 6 percent from inpatient rehabilitation facilities and 4 percent from outpatient hospital providers. CMS noted that the RAC contingency fees generated a cost of 20 cents on each dollar recovered making it a successful undertaking.

The Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 has made the RAC program permanent and required its expansion nationwide. According to CMS, the RAC program will expand to 19 states by October 2008, four more by March 2009 and the remaining states by August 2009. Most of the Mid-Atlantic States including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York and Delaware are in the August 2009 timetable.

At the beginning of the permanent RAC program, it is CMS' belief that the RACs will focus on hospitals and health systems so it is important for these entities to be ready. This can be assisted by having systems in place to allow for:

- Responding to record requests within the required time frames;
- Internal monitoring protocols to better identify and monitor areas that may be subject to review;
- Implementation of compliance efforts that include documentation and coding education;

- Preparing for appeals to challenge denials or adjustments.

One question that remains is how much more expansion of this program will occur. The recommendation is to adequately train and educate all personnel in order to limit any errors that may occur in the categorizing, coding and decision making for the provision of medical services.

For additional information:

[//www.cms.hhs.gov/rac/downloads/RAC_demonstration_evaluation_report.pdf](http://www.cms.hhs.gov/rac/downloads/RAC_demonstration_evaluation_report.pdf)

AHA Pushes for Denial of CMS Authority to Move Forward with Disclosure of Financial Relationships Report (DFRR)

On January 16, 2009, the American Hospital Association sent a letter, on behalf of its members, to the OMB Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs commenting on the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS) proposal to establish a mandatory DFRR for hospital relationships with physicians.

The AHA states "CMS repeatedly has failed to meet its burden under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) to demonstrate that the proposed collection 'is the least burdensome necessary.'" CMS' explanation of the purpose and need continues to be insufficient to justify the time, effort and dedication of resources that would be required of community hospitals. In addition, the current regulations do not support imposition of the broad based, all-encompassing demands of the DFRR."

Part of the reasoning for the AHA's position is that burden is far greater than CMS projects, including estimates that:

- At least 200 hours are needed just to identify and assemble all relevant contracts;
- Three to four weeks would be required to fully respond to a request for a DFRR, assuming no vacations or holidays for involved staff;
- Two to three months would be required to fully respond with one fulltime equivalent employee's time dedicated;
- Smaller hospitals would have fewer contracts, with fewer staff to complete the work, and a greater need for outside attorneys or auditor support;
- Hospitals with a fiscal year that does not coincide with the calendar year would be required to provide documents for two fiscal years, doubling their workload.

This is the second time this proposal has been pursued by CMS. A similar proposal was submitted and then withdrawn by CMS in 2008, in the face of strong opposition. The fact that it has been proposed again would seem to indicate that CMS feels it is necessary and appropriate and is determined to see it occur. Stay tuned for further developments.

For additional information see attached AHA letter.

Copyright 2008

Baratz & Associates, P.A.
4A Eves Drive, Suite 106
Marlton, NJ 08053
(856) 985-5688
Clifford Simmons, CPA

E-mail: simmonsc@baratzcpa.com

Disclaimer: The information included in this correspondence is for reference use only and does not constitute the rendering of legal, financial or other professional advice by Baratz & Associates, P.A.



**American Hospital
Association**

Liberty Place, Suite 700
325 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004-2802
(202) 638-1100 Phone
www.aha.org

January 16, 2009

Sent Via FAX: 202-395-6974

OMB Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
Attention: Bridget Dooling, CMS Desk Officer
New Executive Office Building
Room 10235
Washington, DC 20503

***RE: Disclosure of Financial Relationships Report ("DFRR"): Form Number: CMS-10236
(OMB#: 0938—New), Vol. 73, No. 245 Fed. Reg., December 19, 2008***

Dear Bridget Dooling:

On behalf of our more than 5,000 member hospitals, health systems and other health care organizations, and our 38,000 individual members, the American Hospital Association (AHA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services' (CMS) proposal to establish a mandatory Disclosure of Financial Relationships Report (DFRR) for hospital relationships with physicians.

We urge the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to deny CMS authorization to proceed with this information collection as proposed. CMS repeatedly has failed to meet its burden under the *Paperwork Reduction Act* (PRA) to demonstrate that the proposed collection "is the least burdensome necessary." CMS' explanation of the purpose and need continues to be insufficient to justify the time, effort and dedication of resources that would be required of community hospitals. In addition, the current regulations do not support imposition of the broad-based, all-encompassing demands of the DFRR.

CMS' PROPOSAL DOES NOT SATISFY THE PRA REQUIREMENTS

CMS is seeking clearance for the second time for an "information collection request" that will require hundreds of community hospitals to report information, supply documents and make certain legal certifications regarding their relationships with physicians. With the exception of the number of hospitals affected – 400 instead of 500 – and the estimate of burden – an increase from 31 to 100 hours (still, in our estimation, understated) – the proposal is substantially identical to the one submitted to OMB in September 2007 and withdrawn in April 2008 in the face of serious objections by the AHA and others.

CMS, again, has not demonstrated a problem or concern that would merit this intrusive, costly and very burdensome demand on community hospitals. At most, it offers a general statement that it will use the information to determine the compliance of each hospital with the physician self-referral law, and to assist in developing a disclosure process for all hospitals. Yet CMS' submission makes clear that its purpose cannot be met through the DFRR. **We again object to the proposed information collection request on behalf of the hundreds of community hospitals that would be subject to this unreasonable mandate.**

The DFRR cannot achieve the stated purpose.

By emphasizing the limitations of the DFRR review in its submission, CMS effectively acknowledges that the review process cannot be a reliable measure of compliance. CMS explicitly advises hospitals that they cannot rely on the results of the review as a determination that their contracts comply with the self-referral law. Furthermore, CMS warns hospitals that any finding of no violations is effectively irrelevant for purposes of future review of the same information, whether by CMS or another government entity. **By its own admission, CMS has established that this burdensome tool will not produce reliable information for determining hospital compliance or for any future policy development.**

Equally important, CMS' use of the DFRR would be fundamentally unfair. While each hospital is required to expend maximum resources in responding, there is no possibility that they can walk away from the review with clearance from the agency that their contracts are compliant. Hundreds of community hospitals effectively would be required to disclose all information regarding compensation arrangements with physicians without any benefit.

CMS regulations create a complex web of ever-changing guidance. The challenge of determining what is required is daunting, and the consequences of a violation can be draconian. Yet CMS imposes only the extraordinary burden of the DFRR on hospitals. **If the DFRR is for the purpose of determining compliance, hospitals should be able to rely on CMS' findings that there are no violations and have the benefit of a binding determination that cannot be second-guessed by CMS or others.**

The burden imposed on community hospitals is significantly understated.

The burden estimate and CMS' description of what a response will require are still at odds with what will actually be required of hospitals. Record keeping is predominantly manual, not electronic; documents are decentralized, not centralized; and there is no required "self-referral law" filing system.

Some anecdotal estimates of the burden estimates for hospitals:

- The number of contracts affected could include: 400; 500-600; or 800-1,000.
- At least 200 hours will be needed just to identify and assemble all of the relevant contracts.
- Three to four weeks would be required to fully respond, assuming no vacations or holidays for involved staff.
- Two to three months would be required to respond with one full-time equivalent employee's time.

- Smaller hospitals would have fewer contracts, with fewer staff to complete the work, and a greater need for outside attorneys or auditor support.
- Hospitals with a fiscal year that does not coincide with the calendar year would be required to provide documents for two fiscal years, doubling their workload.

While CMS has increased (insufficiently) its estimate of burden in this proposal, it has made no adjustment in the magnitude of what it requires of hospitals. Information is still required for 12 different categories of compensation arrangements. For those categories most commonly engaged in (e.g., personal services or recruitment arrangements), CMS asks for copies of every contract in effect during a calendar year. Depending on the size of the hospital, documents will be required for hundreds or thousands of contracts. (Requiring only one copy if an agreement is used uniformly would have limited effect and not materially reduce the burden.)

In addition to locating, assembling and copying the documents, the information would need to be reviewed to enable the CEO to make the required certifications. Legal counsel would routinely be involved in these reviews. While CMS has recognized that completion of the process is more than ministerial, its latest estimate of burden still falls significantly short of the mark. Its increase in the cost estimate is also significantly understated. For example, CMS assigns a rate of \$57 per hour in estimating the costs for attorney's fees. This is extremely unrealistic for an attorney with the degree of specialty that is required to master the self-referral regulations.

CURRENT REPORTING RULE DOES NOT SUPPORT THE DFRR

Under the current reporting rule, routine mandatory reporting is not required. While mandatory reporting was included in the proposed rule, CMS made a conscious decision to abandon that approach because of the undue burden. While CMS reserved the right to make individual requests, the DFRR is not an individualized request but a general demand. To proceed under the current rule, CMS would need to establish a specific need for information from an individual hospital. Instead, the DFRR makes a broad-based demand unrelated to the specific circumstances of each hospital. **A change in regulation is required to pursue that type of request.**

CMS also continues to reference its response to the congressional directive in the *Deficit Reduction Act of 2005* (DRA) that it “develop a strategic and implementing plan” to address issues of concern to Congress regarding “physician investment in specialty hospitals.” The AHA supports and encourages CMS to complete the work it started and any additional work that may be needed to address the physician investment issue of concern to Congress. However, that is unrelated to this information collection request and CMS should not blur the two: The DRA did not mandate and does not justify the information collection request regarding community hospitals' compensation arrangements.

The AHA urges OMB to deny CMS authorization to proceed with the DFRR as proposed.

Bridget Dooling
January 16, 2009
Page 4 of 4

For additional background and ease of reference, the AHA's previous comment letters to CMS and OMB on the DFRR are attached. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or Maureen Mudron, deputy general counsel, at (202)626-2301 or mmudron@aha.org.

Sincerely,

// s //

Rick Pollack
Executive Vice President

Attachments

AHA Comment Letter to CMS, July 16, 2007
AHA Comment Letter to OMB, October 10, 2007
AHA Comment Letter to CMS, DFRR section, June 9, 2008